

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498
Serial No.: 10/657,339

PATENT
PF020116

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 3, 2007. Claims 1-7 are pending in the application. By the present amendment, claim 1 has been amended. No new matter has been added.

In general, the present principles are directed to a process for controlling an audio/video decoder. A common problem associated with decoding a video bit stream upon changing a display mode is the appearance of a black screen coupled with a slight delay (see, e.g., Specification, p. 2, lines 10-13). For example, a user may wish to "slow down" the display to inspect objects within video frames by extending the time in which certain frames are displayed. One way this may be achieved is by configuring the decoder to display only frames of a specific type in real time, while excluding the display of others. However, upon returning to a normal play mode, a delay results because the decoder requires a moment to resynchronize the video stream with an audio stream (see, e.g., Specification, p. 2, lines 10-13).

One aspect of the present principles includes continuously decoding the entirety of the video stream in synchronism with decoding the audio stream upon receiving and servicing a request to display only part of the images of the video stream (see, e.g., Specification, p. 10, lines 6-30). Thus, this aspect of the present principles avoids a display delay after returning to a normal play mode, as the audio and video stream decoding are continuously synchronized throughout the transition (see, e.g., Specification, p. 10, lines 31-35).

Claim 1 includes the feature of receiving and responding to a request to display only a portion of the images of a video stream. The prior art does not anticipate this feature, as discussed herein below. Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that claim 1 is patentably distinct over the cited reference.

B. Whether Claim 1 is Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by Sun

B1. Claim 1 is patentable at least because Sun does not disclose receiving and servicing a request to display only part of the images of a video stream.

Sun does not anticipate claim 1, as Sun fails to disclose the claim feature of receiving and responding to a request to display only a portion of an image sequence. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single or prior art reference" (MPEP §2131, quoting *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of*

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498
Serial No.: 10/657,339

PATENT
PF020116

California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)) Elements of claim 1 include, inter alia: “receiving a request for displaying only part of the images” and “responsive to the request, generating a video signal based on only part of the images of the sequence.”

Sun does not expressly or inherently describe receiving and servicing a request for displaying only part of an image sequence. Sun describes a method for efficiently employing a frame buffer memory (see Sun, column 3, lines 23-25). Specifically, the method is directed to avoiding any tearing of displayed frames, which occurs when newly decoded frames overwrite a memory location storing a displayed frame (see, Sun, Fig. 1B; column 2, line 57 to column 3, line 4). To avoid tearing, Sun discloses adapting a decoder to simply add a memory slot (four-slot frame buffer) or skip the display of a newly decoded frame that would otherwise overwrite a displayed frame (see Sun, column 5, lines 42-46; and column 6, lines 7-13). While Sun states that it is possible to freeze a display with a four-slot frame buffer (see Sun, column 5, lines 46-47), Sun does not expressly describe the claim elements of receiving and responding to a request for displaying only part of an image sequence.

Moreover, Sun fails to inherently describe receiving and responding to a request for displaying only part of an image sequence. “[A]nticipation by inherent disclosure is appropriate only when the reference discloses prior art that must necessarily include the unstated limitation. . . .” Transclean Corp. v. Bridgewood Services, Inc., 290 F.3d 1364, 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (citing Cont’l Can Co. v. Monsanto Co., 948 F.2d 1264, 1268-69, 20 USPQ2d 1746, 1749 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (emphasis in original text)). As discussed above, Sun merely states that freezing a display is possible with a four-slot frame buffer. Freezing a display does not necessarily include the steps of receiving and responding to a request for displaying only part of an image sequence, as a decoder may be configured to automatically freeze a display upon an error in processing or some other predetermined event. Accordingly, Sun fails to either expressly or inherently describe the claim elements of receiving and responding to a request for displaying only part of an image sequence.

Additionally, the Examiner has asserted that Sun’s description of tearing an image frame anticipates receiving a request for displaying only part of an image (August 3, 2007 Office Action, p. 2, section 8) (citing Sun, elements 141 and 142 of Fig. 1B). However, as discussed above, tearing is a result of overwriting a memory slot that stores a displayed frame and is an error specifically avoided by the methods disclosed in Sun. Tearing of an image frame, as disclosed in Sun, is not a description of receiving a request of any kind.

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498
Serial No.: 10/657,339

PATENT
PF020116

Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Sun, as Sun fails to anticipate at least the claim feature of receiving and servicing a request to display only part of the images if the video stream. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Moreover, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-7 is also respectfully requested due at least to their dependencies on claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments to the claims and the accompany remarks, applicants solicit entry of this amendment and allowance of the claims. If, however, the Examiner believes such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicants' attorney at (609) 734-6820, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Please charge the \$810 fee for the RCE and any other costs that may be due to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
DANIEL CREUSOT ET AL.

By: 

Robert B. Levy, Attorney
Reg. No. 28,234
Phone (609) 734-6820

RBL:pdf

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312

November 26, 2007